

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

Status Of The Claims

Claims 1-14 are rejected.

Claims 1, 7, and 9 are amended.

No new matter is added.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 7 and 9 are objected to for having informalities. Specifically, the Examiner notes that “m” and “n” are undefined. Applicants have amended claims 7 and 9 to address these objections. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the objections to claims 7 and 9 be withdrawn.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-5 and 10-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Japanese Patent Publication JP 06-075105 to Umemoto et al. (“Umemoto”) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0036738 to Zhou et al. (“Zhou”). Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentable over the cited references.

Amended independent claim 1 recites a flat microlens, wherein the microlens is “formed using a single transparent DLC film.” Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest this feature.

Umemoto describes a lens array plate and its production. The lens array plate is made up of a transparent base material having a plurality of lens regions, where each lens region has a

refractive index distribution. The Examiner concedes that Umemoto does not disclose a microlens formed from a transparent DLC film, and attempts to cure this deficiency with Zhou.

Zhou describes an optical medium having a graded effective refractive index. The optical medium is required to be formed from at least two different materials. Zhou does not even contemplate an optical medium formed from a single material, and even teaches away from an optical medium formed from a single material. As described in the specification, the optical medium “consists of a large number (e.g., 306) of alternating thin layers of silica (SiO₂) and titania (TiO₂).” *See* Specification, ¶[0052]. Alternatively, “a third material (or more) could be added,” or, “[i]n another alternative embodiment, small size grains or dots of one material are embedded in another material.” *See* Specification, ¶[0056].

In contrast, the presently claimed invention is directed to a flat microlens, wherein the microlens is “formed using a single transparent DLC film.” Thus, the microlens of the presently claimed invention is formed from a single DLC film.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-5 and 10-14 depend from claim 1. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2-5 and 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Umemoto in view of Zhou, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,442,482 to Johnson et al. (“Johnson”).

Johnson describes a light diffusing screen made up of an array of microlenses.

Claims 6-9 depend from claim 1, and Johnson does not cure the deficiencies of Umemoto and Zhou. Thus, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6-9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: July 23, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By


Louis J. DelJuidice

Registration No.: 47,522

DARBY & DARBY P.C.

P.O. Box 770

Church Street Station

New York, New York 10008-0770

(212) 527-7700

(212) 527-7701 (Fax)

Attorney For Applicants